



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov

VOICE 410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-3042

August Emergency Minutes

Tuesday, August 16, 2016; 7:00 p.m.

The second emergency meeting for the year 2016 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, August 16, 2016 in the Columbia/Ellicott City Room located 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. All cases are public meetings unless otherwise indicated. All inquiries should be made to: 410-313-2350.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; and Erica Zoren, Bruno Reich

Staff present: Samantha Holmes, Beth Burgess, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Yvette Zhou

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 16-23 – 6195 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge
2. 16-54 – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 16-55 – 8137 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 16-56 – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 16-57 – 8167 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 16-58 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City

16-23 – 6195 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: David Errera

Background & Scope of Work: According to SDAT this house dates to 1932. This property is located in the Lawyers Hill Historic District. The Applicant originally proposed to remove the timber retaining walls and install a Belgard Belair segmental retaining wall system in the color Sable Blend, which is a dark gray color. The segmental retaining wall system is made of precast concrete block. The Applicant proposed to remove the front section of the existing retaining walls that run parallel to Lawyers Hill Road and construct the new walls about 6 to 10 feet back from the road to improve the line of sight for vehicles exiting the driveway.

The Commission found the proposed concrete retaining wall system was not appropriate for Lawyers Hill and asked the Applicant to identify alternative products. The Applicant now proposes to replace the existing timber retaining wall with stone retaining walls. Some of the soil will be removed from the



Figure 1 - Proposed stone

existing landscape to bring down the grade of the land in order to build lower retaining walls. The stone retaining walls will have a maximum height of 35 inches and will generally follow the existing curvature of the driveway. The application states, “the soil behind the retaining walls will have a maximum slope 2 to 1 (horizontal to vertical). No tree removal will be required.” The application also states that the wall will use the same materials that were used in the Claremont Overlook development on Lawyers Hill Road. The mailbox will be attached to a post in the ground on the west side of the driveway, in the general vicinity of the existing mailbox.

The Applicant will also install low voltage LED down lights in the trees along the driveway. A low voltage transformer will be installed on the east side exterior of the house. The transformer will be mounted in conformance with the manufacturer’s recommendations. The power cables from the transformer to the lights will be buried underground. There will be approximately 8 lights, which will be solid cast brass and will be CAST, Volt or similar fixtures.



Figure 2 - Proposed lighting



Figure 31 - Existing driveway



Staff Comments: Chapter 9.D explains, “because homes in Lawyers Hill fit into the natural contours of the surrounding hills, the need for retaining walls has been minimized, and they occur infrequently within the District. Retaining walls in the District are generally low, brick or stone walls that have been built to form decorative structures such as a flower bed or water fountain. High timber retaining walls have been used at one driveway entrance to minimize the need to clear and grade the adjacent slopes. New retaining walls that will be visible from public roads or neighboring properties should be unobtrusive and constructed or faced with brick or stone.” The Guidelines also recommend, “design new retaining walls to be low and constructed or faced with brick or stone.” The current proposal now complies with the Guidelines as the retaining walls will be constructed out of stone.

The Guidelines also recommend, “where higher retaining walls are required, consider using a series of short, stepped walls with landscape plantings rather than one single high wall.” The proposed wall will not be terraced, but will be smaller than the existing timber walls by removing soil.

The lights are small, will be located in the trees and in a color that will blend with the surroundings. Chapter 9.F explains that “historically, Lawyers Hill has had no street lights and minimal outdoor lighting. Outdoor lighting currently found in the Historic District includes fixtures attached to buildings and

freestanding fixtures along driveways. The fixtures are generally unobtrusive and the level of lighting in the community is low.” The proposed lights will be located along the driveway and mounted in the trees, creating a downlight on the driveway. The lights will also be low voltage and will not be overly bright.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the stone retaining walls and exterior lights.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in David Errera and Patti Robey. Mr. Roth recused himself being a neighbor to the Applicant. Mr. Errera said the wall will be a natural stone wall that is no more than four feet tall at the tallest point in the front of the driveway to be in compliance with Guidelines. Mr. Errera said he would also like to use the same natural stone wall around flower beds and the house, which currently are the same timbers as the driveway. Mr. Errera stated that no trees will need to be removed and the lighting would illuminate the driveway at night. Ms. Tennor asked if the grading was modified in order to have lower height walls. Mr. Errera stated the contractor will landscape it for every 2 feet of run over one foot of rise, which will be the maximum slope. Mr. Errera explained that the retaining walls will be the same as the one at Claremont Overlook. He said the highest point will be at the end of the driveway at the public right of way. Mr. Reich asked if the photo (figure 1) is the wall in Claremont Overlook. Mr. Errera stated yes. Mr. Errera asked when he can build the proposed wall. Ms. Holmes stated approvals will be sent this week.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-54 – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. This building was damaged in the July 30, 2016 flash flood. The Applicant proposes to replace the brick that was damaged by the flood and replace the damaged/missing front door to match the door that was in place prior to the flood. The door will be a wood door with a full lite. This property was posted 24 hours in advance of this emergency meeting as required by the Rules of Procedure.



Figure 4 - Damage to building



Figure 4 - Damage to building



Figure 4 - Photo from 2012

Staff Comments: The application is for the in-kind repair of the damaged brick veneer. The application complies with Chapter 6.D recommendations, “replacing damaged bricks or concrete blocks with new units that exactly match the existing material.” The replacement door will exactly match the previously existing door, which is considered Routine Maintenance, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The repair of the bricks is also considered Routine Maintenance.

The brick veneer was added on and is not original to the building. The veneer does not necessarily need to be replaced; the remaining bricks could be removed adjacent to the door and the original surface repaired. This work would also be eligible for tax credits as it restores an original feature to the building.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work. Alternatively Staff recommends Approval and tax credit pre-approval to repair the building without adding the brick veneer back on as explained above.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Courtney Kehoe. Mr. Reich asked if the bricks on the left side of the building will be replaced to match existing bricks on the rest of the building. Ms. Kehoe stated yes. Mr. Bennett expressed concern for the bricks above the doorway and not having support for the lintel. He stated some additional bricks are needed to patch in and repair. The Commission did not have any further discussion on the scope of work.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted for the replacement of the brick facade. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-55 – 8137 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1906. This building was damaged in the July 30, 2016 flash flood. The front door was lost in the flood. The Applicant proposes to install new doors to match the previously existing doors. The doors will be a double wood full lite door. The doors will be painted black. This property was posted 24 hours in advance of this emergency meeting as required by the Rules of Procedure.

Staff Comments: The replacement door will exactly match the previously existing door, which is considered Routine Maintenance, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The paint color will be a change as the previous door was painted off-white. Staff is unsure if the iron outer door was damaged in the flood, but if it is intact, it would be more appropriate to have the inner doors painted black as to not detract from the architectural detail of the iron door. The black color complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building.”



Figure 6 - Google Street View "before"



Figure 5 - After flood

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: Ms. Kehoe had already been sworn in. Ms. Kehoe stated the marble landing tile in front of the door also washed away during the flash flood and will need to be replaced. Ms. Tennor asked what happened to the iron grill doors that were original to the building and matched the window grills that remained. Ms. Kehoe stated they were removed for easier access for the tenant's store but those doors are being saved and stored. The replacement door will be full lite and painted black to match existing. The proposal is to amend the application to include tax credit pre-approval for the in-kind replacement of marble landing above the steps in the entrance doorway.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted including the replacement of marble landing above the steps in the entrance doorway and pre-approval for tax credits. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-56 – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. This building was damaged in the July 30, 2016 flash flood and the storefront/front façade was destroyed. The Applicant proposes to rebuild the storefront to look like it did prior to the flood. The entire storefront wall and windows need to be rebuilt. Two new wood doors will be installed to replace the previously existing doors. The building will be painted to match the previously used colors, a light sage green. The doors were previously a light pink, but the Applicant was approved to paint them Benjamin Moore Black Raspberry, an eggplant purple, in April 2016. This property was posted 24 hours in advance of this emergency meeting as required by the Rules of Procedure.



Figure 7 – Photos from April 2016



Figure 9 - After flood



Figure 8 - After flood

Staff Comments: The replacement doors will exactly match the previously existing doors, which is considered Routine Maintenance, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The rebuilding of the previous design also qualifies as Routine Maintenance provided that the same materials are used. Wood siding will need to be used in order to be considered Routine Maintenance and to qualify for the tax credit.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work, contingent upon wood siding being used to exactly match the existing.

Testimony: Courtney Kehoe has already been sworn in. Ms. Tennor asked what color doors the Applicant was choosing, the eggplant purple approved in April 2016 or the current pink color. Ms. Burgess stated the previous approved eggplant color was represented by Mr. Reuwer. Ms. Kehoe stated the proposal is to keep the pink door color with the light green siding and not paint the doors the eggplant color. Mr. Lewis stated in the event the Applicant needs to use materials other than the existing, the Applicant is to bring to HPC staff to determine if there will be a need to return to the Commission. Ms. Kehoe agreed.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted with the pink doors. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-57 – 8167 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs.

Applicant: Doug Thomas

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. SDAT does not have a date of construction for this building, but the building dates to the 1980s and was built after the historic buildings burned down. This building was damaged in the July 30, 2016 flash flood. The Applicant proposes the following work:

1. Replace 3 windows on the rear of the building with Andersen Series 100 composite windows made from Fibex. The windows will be painted a cocoa bean color. The previously existing windows were wood.
2. Replace the back exterior patio double French door with a 15-lite steel door painted colonial red. The previous door was a wood full lite door.
3. Replace two damaged/missing front doors on the building with a full lite wood door to match the previously existing wood door. The colors will match the previous color.

No other windows or doors on the building will be changed other than the ones mentioned above. This property was posted 24 hours in advance of this emergency meeting as required by the Rules of Procedure.



Figure 10 - Rear of 8167 Main Street

Staff Comments: The Applicant proposes to replace the damaged/missing doors and windows on the rear of the building facing the river with a composite window and steel door. The rear of the building is not visible from a public way and the building is not historic. For historic buildings, Chapter 6.G states, “many historic buildings have secondary entrances not visible from street or other properties. Where these entrances already have a modern replacement door, a new door does not necessarily have to be of a historically appropriate style.” Staff has no objection to the use of the modern materials for the rear door and windows in this location, but also finds the proposed French door style is a historically appropriate design. The replacement of the former wood windows with a composite window complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “vinyl windows may be acceptable for modern additions to historic building if the addition is to the rear of the building with little visibility from public ways or neighboring properties.” The building is modern, it is not historic and the composite window is more appropriate than vinyl.

The damaged front doors will be replaced in-kind to match the existing with a full lite wood door, painted to match the existing colors. This item is Routine Maintenance.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Mike Mullandor. Mr. Mullandor did not have additional comments. Mr. Taylor stated there was a typo in the agenda and there is no tax credit pre-approval because the building is not a historic property. The Commission had no comments on the scope of work.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-58 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Ronald Peters

Background & Scope of Work: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1850. This building was damaged in the July 30, 2016 flash flood. The Applicant proposes to repair the damage to the front porch using the same materials, such as wood, and paint colors to match what previously existed. The Applicant also proposes to repoint and repair damaged bricks on the side of the building (visible from Church Road) and put a water seal on the bricks.

Staff Comments: The work is all considered Routine Maintenance, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The same materials, design and finishes will be used.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.



Figure 1211 - Photo from 2015



Figure 112 - Flood damage



Figure 13 - Bricks on rear/side of building

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Ronald Peters. Mr. Peters stated due to flooding, there was need to repoint and repair damaged bricks on the side of the building (visible from Church Road) and put a water seal on the bricks. The Commission had no questions or comments concerning the scope of work.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

The Commission moved to an administrative session to discuss the flood damage to Historic Ellicott City and consideration of procedures for emergency applications for Certificate of Approval and administrative approval procedures. DPZ Deputy Director, Amy Gowan, attended this portion of the meeting. Ms. Holmes provided the Commission members with a draft of the proposed criteria for administrative approval. The staff explained the purpose is to expedite the consent approval process especially with the expected large load of emergency applicants coming in. This draft was compiled from other jurisdiction's procedures to increase efficiency and eliminate frustration. The consent approvals would still have Commission oversight and any application could be removed from the consent and reviewed at the upcoming HPC meeting. Public comment would be addressed in the process to ensure due process for any contested cases.

Mr. Lewis stated the specifics of the proposed changes of the process need to be further discussed. The Code and Rules of Procedure need to be updated and there is a public process that will be followed.

Mr. Allan Shad moved to adjourn. Ms. Eileen Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 8:02pm.

Allan Shad, Chair

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner

Yvette Zhou, Recording Secretary